

AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS

The attached "Replacement Sheet," which includes FIGS. 1(a) and 1(b), replaces the original sheet including FIGS. 1(a) and 1(b).

Attachment: Replacement Sheet

REMARKS

Claims 1-4 are now pending in the application. Applicant cancels claims 5-7 without disclaimer or prejudice to the subject matter contained therein. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejection in view of the amendments and remarks contained herein.

DRAWINGS

The drawings stand objected to for certain informalities. Applicant has attached revised drawings for the Examiner's approval. In the "Replacement Sheet," Applicant changed reference numeral "6" to "7" and changed reference numeral "7" to "8" in FIG. 1(a) according to the Examiner's suggestion.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-7 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Ohhashi (U.S. Pat. No. 6,586,815). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Applicant's invention is directed to a semiconductor device that prevents structure deficiencies to maintain reliability of a fuse. More specifically, the semiconductor device includes an "opening section exposing an entire portion of the first protection film located directly above the fuse." In this manner, the invention prevents cracks from developing that reduce the reliability of the fuse as shown in Applicant's prior art FIG. 3.

In contrast, Ohhashi is directed to a semiconductor device with dummy interconnections that facilitates removal of selected fuse bodies. The fuse bodies are

sized and spaced apart in a manner to prevent damage to non-selected fuse bodies, and to further prevent thermal conduction in a longitudinal direction of the fuse bodies. Ohhashi discloses reducing the length of fuse bodies in order facilitate selective removal (i.e. melting by application of a laser beam) of a particular fuse body. Due to specific spacing requirements, Ohhashi discloses that the fuse bodies have a length "not exceeding a diameter of laser beam to blow off at least one of the fuse bodies." (Column 7, Lines 14-20). In other words, Ohhashi discloses reducing the length of the fuse bodies rather than increasing a size of an opening formed above the fuse bodies. The diameter of the laser beam is then selected according to limitations defined by the fuse body lengths and spacing between individual fuse bodies.

Applicant's invention allows for a laser beam having a diameter less than a length of the upper wiring layer 7. For example, "the width of the opening section H is at least equal to a width of the upper wiring layer 7." (Paragraph [0043] of Applicant's invention). It is anticipated that the opening section H may be equal to the width of the upper wiring layer. A diameter of a laser beam used to irradiate the first protection film 8 must therefore be less than the width of the opening section H, and therefore less than a width of the upper wiring layer 7. In other words, Applicant's invention does not require that length (width) of the upper wiring layer 7 is not greater than the diameter of the laser beam. Indeed, Applicant's invention anticipates that the length of the upper wiring layer 7 is greater than the diameter of the laser beam. Applicant amends claim 1 to clarify that the upper wiring layer has "a first length being greater than a diameter of a laser that is used to irradiate the first protection film." Ohhashi does not disclose such a structure. Ohhashi discloses fuse bodies having a length that does not exceed a

diameter of a laser. Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1, as well as its corresponding dependent claims, should be in condition for allowance. Claim 3, as well as its corresponding dependent claims, includes analogous subject matter and should be allowable for the same reasons.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action, and as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: Aug 16, 2005

By: 

G. Gregory Schivley
Reg. No. 27,382

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
(248) 641-1600

GGG/DMA